

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Figures 2 and 5 have been amended. In Figure 2, one of the lead lines from reference numeral 109 has been omitted. A second reference numeral 109 has been added. A reference numeral 115 has been added with two lead lines. In Figure 5, a reference numeral 115 has been added sharing a lead line with reference numeral 109.

Two replacement sheets are included with this response.

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 1, 2005 having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 1, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, paragraphs [0002], [0005], and [0017] have been amended to clarify aspects of the invention. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

In the drawings, Figures 2 and 5 have been amended. In Figure 2, one of the lead lines from reference numeral 109 has been omitted. A second reference numeral 109 has been added. A reference numeral 115 has been added with two lead lines. In Figure 5, a reference numeral 115 has been added sharing a lead line with reference numeral 109. Two replacement sheets are included with this response. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

Claims 1-10, 17, and 18 remain pending in the application after entry of this response. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended and claims 11-14 and 19-21 have been canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-14, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of Hornig (U.S. Pat. No. 6,697,256) and Inoue (U.S. Pat. No. 6,311,767) or Michael (U.S. Pat. No. 6,778,390). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of Inoue and Kitajo (U.S. Pat. No. 5,838,066). Claims 8, 10, and 21 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Hornig and Inoue. Reconsideration of the claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Drawing Objection

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention as specified in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner cites the computer recited in claim 19 as not being shown in the drawings. Claim 19 has been canceled. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection and claim 11 and its dependents have been canceled. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-14, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of Hornig and Inoue or Michael. Claims 11-14, 19, and 20 have been canceled.

Neither Hornig nor Inoue teach, suggest, or disclose a fin having a length equal to or greater than a length of the processor, as recited in amended claim 1. Hornig illustrates a processor 12 having a length and width of about 1.75 inches. The longest fin shown in Hornig's figures is less than 1.25 inches in length. The length of Inoue's fins 22 roughly correspond to the diameter of the heat pipe 20 and are thus much shorter than the processor. Michael does not teach, suggest, or disclose a heat sink lid covering only a portion of the fins proximate the fan, as recited in amended claim 1. Michael's top 311 only leaves a slight portion of heat sinks 305,307 uncovered and these heat sinks 305,307 are for the memory chips 121, not the GPU 119.

Regarding motivation to combine, the Examiner cites noise reduction as a motivation to combine. However, none of the cited references even mention noise and it is impermissible hindsight to use Applicant's disclosure to obtain a motivation to combine. Hornig is directed to an improved fastening device. Inoue's device uses a heat pipe to satisfy the confined physical dimensions of a laptop. Michael is directed to improving air flow for increased cooling capacity.

For these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over Hornig and Inoue or Michael. Further, since claims 3-7, 9, 17, and 18 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims also are patentable over Inoue.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Hornig in view of Inoue and Kitajo. Kitajo adds nothing that would cure the deficiencies of any of Hornig and Inoue, discussed above. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Hornig in view of Inoue and Kitajo. Claim 2 is also allowable over Hornig in view of Inoue and Kitajo since it depends from claim 1.

Claims 8, 10, and 21 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Hornig and Inoue. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Hornig and Inoue. Claims 8, 10, and 21 are also allowable over Hornig and Inoue since they depend from claim 1.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as now claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenyon Ripple
Registration No. 55,769
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
595 Shrewsbury Ave. Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702
Telephone: (650) 330-2310
Facsimile: (650) 330-2314
Attorney for Applicant(s)